Washington State Department of Transportation
15700 Dayton Avenue North
Seattle, WA 98133

February 4, 2005

Request For Proposals
Everett HOV Design-Build

ATTENTION: All Short-listed Proposers

Response To Questions No. 4

26. **Question**: The RFP indicates WSDOT is preparing draft right of way plans and that they will be available to the D/B teams. Since they are not indicated as part of the CD associated with Answers to Question #2, when will they be available?
Response: These were provided in Addendum #2.

27. **Question:** Please further clarify the answer to RFI question #8.
Response: Technical Specification 2.16.1.3 contains a bolded heading as follows:

Broadway Interchange (SR99/SR527/SR526/SR5)

This is the interchange that is generally located in the vicinity of I-5 milepost 188.5 to 190. Highmasts are required at that interchange.

Technical Specification 2.16.1.4 contains a bolded heading as follows:

41st Street/Broadway Interchange

This is the interchange that is generally located in the vicinity of I-5 milepost 192 to 193. This interchange requires standard lighting.

These approximate mileposts will be added by addendum.

The Department considered the environmental effects of the lighting described above during preparation of the NEPA document, and concluded that there is no significant impact. If the Design-Builder installs lights in these interchanges as described in the RFP, the Design-Builder has no responsibility to evaluate environmental impacts. If the Design-Builder proposes to install highmast lights at the 41st Street/Broadway Interchange, the Design-Builder is at risk to address any challenges to the NEPA document relative to that change.

28. **Question:** re; GP 1-07.6, GP 1-08.8 and TP 2.8.4.2: In the event that project-specific discretionary permits currently being pursued by WSDOT are not obtained within 30 days prior to the Proposal Due Date, the contract provides that the risk for obtaining (and performing any conditions that may ultimately be included) these discretionary Government Approvals upon the Design Builder. We request that

WSDOT be assigned the risk of obtaining any permits and approvals associated with the following Governmental Rules (Permits to be Acquired by the Agency):

- Section 404
- Section 401 Water Quality Certification
- Shoreline Substantial Development,
- Floodplain Development and Wetland Alteration
- Archeological and Historic Preservation Act: 16 U.S.C. 469-469C, 36 CFR 66(draft)
- Archeological Resources Protection Act: 16 U.S.C. 470aa-11, 18 CFR 1312, 32CFR229, 36 CFR 79, 36 CFR 296, 43 CFR 7
- Clean Air Act (as amended), Transportation Conformity Rule: 23 U.S.C. 109(j), 42 U.S.C. 7521(a), 23 CFR 771, 40 CFR 51 & 93
- Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended 16 U.S.C. 3501-3510, 42 U.S.C. 4028
- Coastal Zone Management Act: 16 U.S.C. 145 et seq., 15 CFR 923, 926, 930, 23 CFR 771
- Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA), as amended: 42 U.S.C. 9601-9657
- Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ): Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, Section 1110: 23 U.S.C. 149
- Endangered Species Act, as amended: 16 U.S.C. 1531-1543, 7 CFR 355, 50 CFR 17, 23, 81, 222, 225-227, 402, 424, 450-453
- Environmental Justice: Executive Order 12898, 59 FR 7629, 62 FR 18377, 60 FR 33896
- Farmland Protection Policy Act: 7 U.S.C. 4201-4209, 7 CFR 658
- Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended by the Clean Water Act: 33 U.S.C. 1251-1376, DOT Order 5660.1A, 23 CFR 650 Subpart B, 771, 33 CFR 209, 320-323, 325, 328, 329, 40 CFR 121-125, 129-131, 133, 135-136, 230-231.
- Land and Water Conservation Fund Act (Section 6(f): 16 U.S.C. 460-4 to -11, 36 CFR 59.1)
- Marine Protection Research and Sanctuaries Act: 33 U.S.C. 1401-1445, 33 CFR 320 & 330, 40 CFR 220-225, 227-228, 230-231
- National Environmental Policy Act: 42 U.S.C. 4321-4335, 23 CFR 771-772, 40 CFR 1500-1508; Executive Order 11514 and 11991.
- Native American Grave Protection and Repatriation Act: 25 U.S.C. 3001 et seq., 43 CFR 10
- Protection of Wetlands: Executive Order 11990, DOT Order 5660.1A, 23 CFR 777
- Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), as amended: 42 U.S.C. 6901, et seq., 40 CFR 260-271
- Rivers and Harbors Act: 33 U.S.C. 401, ET SEQ., as amended and supplemented, 23 CFR 650, Subparts D & H, 33CFR114-115

- Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended: 16 U.S.C. 470f, Executive Order 11593, 23 CFR 771, 36 CFR 60, 36 CFR63, 36 CFR 800
- Section 4(f) of The Department of Transportation Act: 23 U.S.C. 138, 49 U.S.C. 303, 23 CFR 771.135
- Superfund Amendment and Reauthorization Act (SARA) 40 CFR 300, 43 CFR 11
- Transportation Enhancement Activities: 23 U.S.C. 101(a)(35), 23 U.S.C. 133(b)
- Water Bank Act: 16 U.S.C. 1301-1311, 7 CFR 752
- Wetlands Mitigation Banks: 23 U.S.C. 103(I)(13), 23 U.S.C. 133(b)(11), 23 CFR 771, 23 CFR 777
- Wild and Scenic Rivers Act: 16 U.S.C. 1271-1287

Response: This is not the approach WSDOT will take. WSDOT will assume the risk for obtaining a finite set of permits and approvals as listed in the table below. These will be listed in upcoming Addendum #4. Those which were obtained by the Department prior to issuing the RFP have been provided in the RFP - most notably the FONSI, the Environmental Assessment, and supporting reports. Those which have been obtained recently will be added by addendum #4 – theses include the HPA, 404 permit, and 401 Letter of Verification. There are other permits/approvals that the Department is and has been pursuing for this project, which have not yet been provided because they have not yet been obtained. The application for these permits was provided to the Teams via RFI #13. The table below summarizes the permits that will be obtained by the Department. Note that the Design-Builder shall be responsible for obtaining any required noise variance, the Section 402 Clean Water Act National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Construction, and any other permits required as described in the Contract.

I-5 Everett HOV Permits/Approvals to be obtained by WSDOT: As Of February 4, 2005

Required Permit or Approval	Lead/Review Agency	Date Permit Approved	Supporting Documents	Status a/o Feb 4, 2005
National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106 Approval	SHPO/Tribes	September 3 & 29, 2004	Cultural, Historic Resource Survey/Tribal Consultation	COMPLETE
Endangered Species Act, Section 7 Consultation	NOAAF/ USFWS	NOAAF Conc. - July 6, 2004 USFWS Conc.– July 8, 2004	Biological Assessment	COMPLETE
National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Environmental Assessment (EA)	WSDOT HQ/ FHWA	Circulation Sept. 14, 2004 Public Hearing Sept. 28, 2004	Discipline Reports	COMPLETE
NEPA EA, Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)	FHWA	Nov. 16, 2004	Environmental Assessment, Public Hearing, Response to Comments	COMPLETE
State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), Adoption	WSDOT NWR	Nov. 19, 2004	NEPA FONSI	COMPLETE
Section 404 Clean Water Act, Nationwide Permit 18	Corps of Engineers (MAP Team)	Jan. 24, 2005	JARPA, General Project Plans, Detailed Aquatic Impact & Mitigation Plans. See MAP Team Complete Appl. Checklist	COMPLETE
Section 401 Clean Water Act, Letter of Verification	Ecology (MAP Team)	Feb 1, 2005	JARPA, General Project Plans, Detailed Aquatic Impact & Mitigation Plans, WQIA certification letter	COMPLETE
Hydraulic Project Approval	WDFW (MAP Team)	Jan. 12, 2005	JARPA, General Project Plans, Detailed Aquatic Impact & Mitigation Plans	COMPLETE
Shoreline Management Substantial Development	City of Everett	Pending	JARPA, General Project Plans, Detailed Aquatic Impact & Mitigation Plans	Application complete. Hearing held 2/3/05
Floodplain Development	City of Everett	Pending	Hydraulic Report	See Shoreline
Wetland and Stream Alteration Review	City of Everett	Pending	Wetland Report, Biological Assessment, Mitigation Plan	See Shoreline
Wetland Buffer Reduction Review	City of Everett	Pending	Wetland Report, Wetland Buffer Narrative, Mitigation Plan	See Shoreline
Special Property Use Review	City of Everett	Pending	Special Property Use Narrative	See Shoreline

Not later than March 9, 2005, an addendum will be issued which captures the status of the permits in the above list that are indicated as "Pending". That addendum will provide a baseline of assumed permit/approval requirements for Proposers to base their Proposal on. The Design-Builder will be required to finalize those incomplete permits after contract execution.

29. **Question**: re: GP 1-07.17(1)--GP 1-07.17(11).3 GP 1-07.17(1) states that Utility Relocations may extend outside of the ROW. Such additional impact could result in the need to amend or seek new discretionary environmental approvals for reasons beyond the control of the Design builder. This risk is exacerbated by the fact that the Design Builder is not granted relief for changes to Utility Owner standards or rules, nor is relief granted for Utility Owner design and construction errors (GP 1-07.17(13). Please add the event of a Relocation resulting in disturbance outside of the ROW to the definition of Necessary Change to Basic Configuration
Response: This is not the approach WSDOT will take. The contract requires a significant amount of work outside of the WSDOT Right of Way, such as in Main Street, 36th Avenue, Smith Avenue, Water Quality site #1, and Water Quality site #2. All of these could potentially involve utility relocations. It is the intent of the contract to allocate this risk to the Design-Builder in order to provide a strong incentive to design the Project to avoid any relocations that would require new environmental approvals.

30. **Question:** GP 1-04.4(2) and GP 1-05.14 States that Design Builder is not granted Contract Price or Contract Time relief related to uncooperative adjacent property owners or contractors. This is an unquantifiable risk. Please consider establishing maximum periods (i.e., 60 days) of delay associated with these events for which the Design Builder will be responsible. If after the expiration of the maximum period, if the delay persists, WSDOT will grant relief thereafter
Response: The Design-Builder is in the best position to control the design and construction work methods which would likely have a greater impact on uncooperative adjacent property owners or contractors. The ability to best mitigate this risk rests with the Design-Builder.

31. **Question:** GP 1-07.17(11) The Utility Delay definition excludes utilities with Utility Owner Cost Responsibility. Please delete this exclusion.
Response: It is true that definition excludes the State for cost responsibility. If a utility delay should occur when the utility owner has cost responsibility, the rights to recover from the utility for this delay have been assigned to the Design-Builder. This delay would be between the Design-Builder and the utility.

32. **Question:** GP 1-07.17(11) Excludes Contract Price relief for Utility Delays. Please consider including relief for contract price impacts associated with utility delays.
Response: WSDOT will continue to allocate the cost risk for utility delays to the Design-Builder. The Design Builder is expected to seek cost recovery from the utility.

33. **Question**: GP 1-08.10(1) Under Termination for Default wherein WSDOT elects to prosecute the Contract Work to completion, Design Builder and Surety are liable for all completion costs including Liquidated Damages in an undetermined amount. There are two significant issues associated with these provisions: 1) the surety industry may have serious concerns regarding assuming a liability absent an ability to affect any outcome; and 2) the lack of any limit on liability associated with this potential scenario. Our surety companies are currently reviewing this language. We will forward their relevant findings to WSDOT as soon as they become available. Please consider establishing a maximum contract liability limit
Response: This is the approach used on all WSDOT projects. The risk of default is best controlled by the Design-Builder.

34. **Question**: GP 1-08.6 There appears to be no remedy available to the Design Builder in the event that timely and due WSDOT payments are not made to the Design Builder. Please add provision to GP 1-08.6 for Design Builder to suspend work prosecution in the event that timely and due WSDOT payments are not made to Design Builder.
Response: The remedies to the Design-Builder are to either bid and build the project with a schedule that does not exceed the maximum payment schedule, or to finance the difference. Availability of funding is defined in the contract, and contract billings are expected to be evaluated by Proposers prior to submitting a Proposal.

35. **Question**: Addendum #1 changed section 1-01.3(1) to say the RFP concept can be changed up to 2' vertically & 12' horizontally without requiring a written approval. However, Addendum #1 did not address Section 2.12.3.4-Noise Wall Requirements, which states "If the mainline horizontal alignment changes from the concept more than 10' then a re-analysis of the noise is required." Is further analysis of the noise required if we decide to change the horizontal alignment by up to 12'?
Response: This will be addressed by future addendum, along the following: A noise analysis will be required if the Design-Builder does any one of the following:
    - Change the horizontal alignment of the roadway by more than 12 feet, or
    - Change the horizontal alignment of a noise wall by more than 12 feet, or
    - Changes the distance between a noise wall and nearest adjacent lane by more than 12 feet when compared to the distance in the conceptual plans.

    The Design-Builder will not be allowed to eliminate noise walls.

36. **Question**: The conceptual plans for Bridges 5/633 E & W (Appendix M5) call out an inside shoulder of 6' but the design variance for shoulder width deviations (Appendix M3-Table 2) is for 8.5'. What was the intended width of the inside shoulders on these bridges?
Response: 8.5 feet is correct. This will be addressed by Addendum #4.

37. **Question:** The Max. Superelevation values specified in the "Required" columns appear to be taken from DM Figure 640-11b (6% max) rates rather than DM Figure 640-11a (10% max) rates. Shouldn't we be using the 10% max figures?
Response: This was addressed in Addendum #3.

38. **Question:** The reference specified in the "Ramp/Mainline Tapers" for the FR line off-ramp does not appear to be correct. Shouldn't the values comply with Figure 940-12a?
Response: This will be corrected by addendum.

39. **Question: Broadway SB On Ramp (FL Line)** The Parameters report does not match the drawings. The horizontal curve station location specified in the "Max. Superelevation" column does not appear to be correct. **Shouldn't it be 11+62?**
Response: Yes. The PI station location will be corrected to read 11+62 in addendum #4.

40. **Question: 41st St. On Ramp NB (GR Line)** The Parameters report does not match the drawings. The width criteria specified in the "Turning Roadway Width" column appears to be for a one-lane ramp. Shouldn't it be 26' for R=815' as this is a two-lane ramp for part of the curve?
Response: Use Figure 640-9a for the loop ramp at the ramp terminal, and 640-8a for the curve along the on-ramp. This will be addressed in Addendum #4.

41. **Question: NB SR 2 Off Ramp (IR Line)** The Crest Vertical Curve at Station 18+85 only meets Stopping Sight Distance for 35 mph design speed (not taking into account the adjustment for grade). There is sufficient deceleration lane length for vehicles to slow to this speed, however the design speed for a Freeway-to-Freeway ramp should use the Midrange Ramp Design Speed of DM Figure 940-01 which is 50 mph for a mainline design speed of 70. Is this considered a "Freeway-to-freeway" ramp? Note: the sag vertical curves before and after this crest vertical curve are designed at 45 mph and 35 mph respectively and are covered in the Evaluate Upgrade #2.
Response: It is acceptable to use the Midrange ramp design speed or higher for the subject off-ramps within the SR-2 Interchange.

42. **Question:** NB SR2 On Ramp (JR1 Line)Acceleration lane length is shown as 1200'. Shouldn't this be 1620' according to DM Figure 640-8?
Response: 640-8 does not apply. Refer to DM Table 940-8, the designed length for the acceleration lane was based on 0 MPH ramp speed and 60 MPH main line speed. 1200 feet is acceptable**.**

43. **Question:** Northbound I-5 on ramp from Everett Ave. (JR2 Line) At 11+30 the acceleration lane length is shown as 1400 ft. Should the acceleration lane length be 2430 ft in accordance with DM figure 940-8.
Response: Refer to DM Table 940-8, the designed length for the acceleration lane was based on 0MPH ramp speed and 60MPH main line speed with adjustments for the portions of the roadway with an up/down grades. 1400 feet is acceptable.

44. **Question:** Bridge plans show matching concrete deck surface to existing Latex modified concrete deck surface. This results in different deck surfaces and different conditions for future maintenance. Is this the preferred approach to deck finishes?
Response: Yes, the bridge plans are correct. Match the new deck to the existing latex modified concrete deck.

45. **Question:** Does the existing vertical clearance at Smith overcrossing and Pacific Overcrossing need to be increased to meet the minimum 15' 6" required? Or does only the widened portion of the structure need to meet the clearance requirements?
Response: Smith and Pacific both need to be meet 15'-6" minimum under the entire structure. This will be addressed by Addendum.

46. **Question:** Are as-builts available for the two bridges that receive traffic barrier retrofits? Currently the as-built set does not include these bridges. Also, are traffic barrier retrofits proposed to be barrier replacements or thrie beam rail attachments?
Response: The only bridges on the project where thrie beam is acceptable are at bridge 99/610 and 5/622S-S. Concrete barrier replacement is acceptable for all bridges. As-builts were previously provided on CD.

47. **Question**: Does future widening need to be considered for any of the bridges?
Response: Yes, all bridge designs must accommodate the future 41st Street Interchange. One example is the north abutment of bridge 5/628W N-N must accommodate a future ramp between the abutment and mainline. We did not do an exhaustive review – there may be other examples.

48. **Question:** The proposed structure at Smith, Hewitt and Everett bridges is to add on top of existing abutments. Does that mean then that the existing abutment needs to meet current seismic requirements or can it be checked only for dead and live loads?
Response: The bridges mentioned above are to be widened, in some locations, over existing abutment wall and in some locations over existing retaining walls. Where existing abutment wall is located use all AASHTO LRFD load combinations except Extreme Event-I (seismic). Where the bridge is widened over existing retaining walls (* see note) use all AASHTO LRFD load combinations. *NOTE: As built panels 2B & 2G retaining walls of Hewitt Avenue are considered retaining walls.

49. **Question:** The Bridge Design manual, Section 2.3.1(H), says to use 4 girders minimum for roadways over 32feet wide unless written approval is obtained from bridge design engineer. The roadway at bridge 5/628W N-N ramp is 39feet wide and they only show 3 girders. Does this qualify as written approval of 3 girders at this bridge, or should there be 4?
Response: Yes, three girders will be acceptable for bridge 5/628W N-N. This will be addressed by addendum.

50. **Question:** The General Provisions state that the Contractor is to coordinate all crossings in the FEMA-regulated floodplains. This is normally administered by the local agency (i.e. City of Everett) (General Provisions 2.13.4.2, p. 115). Please clarify that the Contractor is to coordinate all crossing located in FEMA-regulated floodplains with the Department.
Response: The Design Builder will coordinate all crossing in the FEMA-regulated floodplains with the City of Everett. .

51. **Question:** Section 2.13.4.5 (Drainage Outfalls) of the General Provisions document calls for screening of the outfall pipe to restrict fish from moving into the outfall pipe during high flows. Please confirm that the term "screen" refers to provision for a fish barrier and does not explicitly require a screen structure. What fish criteria should be used for the screen (i.e. juvenile versus adult and what species)?
Response: The term fish screen will be deleted from 2.13.4.5 in the next addendum, but could be a permit requirement.

52. **Question:** We did not find any basin delineation maps or corresponding flow calculations representing off-site flow contributions for the Bigelow Creek basin in the Storm water Technical Report. Please confirm this information is not available, or provide a basin map delineation and corresponding flow calculations if they are available.
Response: Offsite basin area information was obtained from the City of Everett. These numbers were shown in tables 4.1 – 4.5 in Stormwater Technical Report for the purpose of analysis. There are only three basins in the project corridor, namely Wood Creek, Lowell and 36th St. Combined. Bigelow Creek is not a basin. There is no other information available. Please refer to 1986 City of Everett Drainage Basin Plans.

53. **Question:** Section 2.13.4.2.6.6 (Pipes and Culverts) of the General Provisions document says that WQF-1 is located in an Urban Flood Fringe District in the FEMA defined floodplain, and can be developed as long as the 100-year flood water level is not increased more than 1-foot. This is also referenced in the Environmental Assessment (pg. 4-8) as a stipulation for permitting and mitigation requirements. Will a separate hydraulic analysis be required as part of the WQF-1 final design confirming that little or no change in 100-year flood level will occur? .
Response: : Yes

54. **Question:** Please provide electronically We cannot see the boundaries of the drainage basin delineations found in Appendix E of Appendix H1 - the Storm water Technical Report, as well as the water quality facilities #3 - #6 footprints in Appendix G of Appendix H1. Please provide updated electronic drawings showing boundaries.
Response: DGN files showing the above files will be included in Addendum #4.

55. **Question:** Please provide profile information for PSH 1 (SR5) Everett Freeway Lowell Road to GN RY O'Xing (8/16/1966?). Also, please provide plan sheets that did not copy well (asbuilt sheets 5 and 6 in RFP, appendix H7 Vol.1 of 2).
Response: PDF files will be included in a future Addendum.

56. **Question:** Please provide back-up calculations or basis for design for the water quality facility's outfall pipe sizes for water quality facilities 1and 2.
Response: Please see backup calculation for the outfall sizing on appendix J-14

57. **Question:** There is a discrepancy in the exhibits with respect to the location of water quality facility #3. Figure E19 and E20 show it located east of the railroad tracks. Figure G3 shows it located west of the tracks, on both sides of the I-5 off-ramp. Which location is correct?
Response: Stormwater Technical Report was written earlier and accordingly figures E19 and E20 are from a preliminary design and are no longer valid. The location of WQF # 3 as shown in figure G3 (Pacific Avenue Offramp) represents the Department's latest design.

58. **Question:** Water quality facility #4 is shown in figure E-21 as located on the pavement and steep side slope to eastbound on-ramp of Hwy-2. However, this same exhibit shows available WSDOT ROW adjacent to the on-ramp. It appears the intent is to use the vacant land within existing WSDOT ROW on the south side of the on-ramp for water quality facility #4. Please confirm location of water quality facility #4.
Response: There are existing bioswales within the US 2 interchange ramps and this is the intent to enhance the existing bioswales to treat runoff using existing right of way. The dgn files of the existing basemap included in CD1 and CD 2 does not show this location, and therefore a new dgn file will be provided by addendum for WQF # 3 to WQF # 6

59. **Question:** Paragraph 2.7.4.1, Design Criteria, sub-paragraph 1 requires "ramps at the gore, shall be designed to accommodate 40 million ESAL's. All other pavement section shall be designed to accommodate 200 million ESAL's." Are these required traffic ESAL's for one lane or several lanes? If the design ESAL's are for one lane only, this seems rather high. Since the majority of new pavements to be constructed will be HOV lanes, they will carry primarily buses and cars with 2 or more people. Assuming only buses make up the 200 million ESAL number, this would mean that the HOV lane would have to accommodate an average of 4,383 buses a day or 183 buses an hour or over 3 buses a minute [(200,000,000(ESAL)/ 2.5(ESAL's per bus)/ 50 (years) / 365 (days)]. The number 2.5 ESAL's per bus assumes the bus is loaded an average of 50%.
Response: The 200 million ESALs are the total (all lanes) directional ESALs for the NB and SB directions (200 million each direction) for the 50 year design period. According to conceptual plans, the widening will occur on the inside in some areas and on the outside in other areas. Our intent is that the design builder applies the

appropriate lane distribution factor to each lane based on their proposal. This will be addressed by Addendum.

60. **Question:** The 40 million ESAL's for ramps also seems high. This translates into 1,085 buses a day. Assuming the design ESAL is only due to trucks, this is equivalent to 2,191 trucks (80,000 lb, 18 wheelers, 5-axles) a day. Please verify that 40 million ESAL's is the required design number for one lane on a ramp.
Response: The 40 million ESALs are the total ESALs for all lanes of the ramps. The design builder needs to apply the appropriate lane distribution factor to each lane. For example, if the ramp was two lanes wide and the weighting factor was 0.5, each lane would result in 20 million ESALs. This will be addressed by Addendum.

61. **Question:** To combat studded tire wear, the Pavement Design Guide, (para. 4.2.5.3) recommends an additional one inch in PCC thickness. Will the State require this additional one inch?
Response: Yes. This will be addressed by addendum.

62. **Question**: Please provide the strength of subgrade soils under new lanes. Please provide the Resilient Modulus for HMA pavements and k Value for PCC pavements
Response: Obtaining the subgrade resilient modulus are Design-Builders responsibilities.

63. **Question**: Please provide pavement structure and strength of shoulders on the opposite side from the new HOV lanes. The shoulders are to be used as a traffic lane during the construction of the new HOV lanes.
Response: Core depths were provided in the RFP Appendix V. How the shoulders will be utilized is the Design-Builders responsibility. Obtaining cores beyond what is already provided in the RFP is the Design-Builders responsibility, and access can be obtained by getting a permit from WSDOT Everett Maintenance Dave Pierce.

64. **Question:** Please provide pavement structure and strength and design ESAL's of Main Street (sheet P25) and 36th Street (sheet P26), Smith Ave (sheet p16) which are to be overlaid or rehabilitated.
Response: WSDOT does not have this information. The Design-Builder should check with the city to determine ESALs.

65. **Question:** Please provide subgrade soil strengths in Resilient Modulus units for all exit ramps where new pavements are to be constructed.
Response: Obtaining the subgrade resilient modulus are Design-Builders responsibilities.

66. **Question:** Does "Attachment 4 – Mitigation Commitment List" from the NEPA FONSI list all the environmental commitments derived from the NEPA process?

Response: Yes, though these are basic commitments and the presumption is that standard legal obligations also apply. These basic commitments may be amended or supplemented through negotiation with the regulating (or approving) agency as part of the permitting process.

67. **Question:** Does a formal NEPA "Record of Commitment" file separate from the FONSI exist for this project?
Response: No, the list in the FONSI is the official record.

68. **Question:** Are specific environmental recommendations contained in the EA Technical Appendices but not included in the FONSI or RFP requirements to be treated as environmental commitments applicable to construction of this project? Examples include:

    - Geology/Soils Report: "A groundwater study should be performed prior to construction of water quality sties to characterize the potential for contaminant transport."
    - HazMat Report: "Line water quality ponds to prevent infiltration" and "Segregate, stockpile and test soil for contaminants prior to disposal."
    - Cultural Resource Report: "Monitor during excavation of Lowell Slide Drainage Easements"

Response: No, the technical report recommendations are not commitments unless specifically included in the Environmental Assessment, FONSI, permit applications, or issued permits. In the case of the three examples; the groundwater study, lining of water quality ponds, or monitoring of excavation at the slide areas would only be necessary if: 1) there is work proposed in the respective area, and/or 2) the recommendation is the best approach in response to the proposed work, and/or 3) it is a legal requirement for performing the proposed work.

69. **Question**: Will WSDOT provide right-of-entry for archeological reconnaissance at WQ Sites #1 (all), #2 (partial) and #3 (all)?
Response: Design-Builder can contact property owners to obtain right of entries to perform archeological reconnaissance at WQ Sites #1 (all), #2 (partial) and #3. If Design-Builder will be proposing to perform invasive archeological reconnaissance such as excavations, WSDOT concurrence is also required in addition to the right of entry.

70. **Question:** Of the 6 WQ sites, #1 and #2 involve new ROW acquisition – will this ROW be in place at NTP?
Response: The exact dates are unknown, but it is unlikely that WQ1 and WQ2 will be obtained before NTP. Late dates are listed in the Technical Specs.

71. **Question:** Does WSDOT have any information on the original topo prior to the original construction of I-5 which could be used with the current topo to determine the thickness of fills along the corridor?

Response: It is possible that a topo from a previous contract may be available from HQ Archives, but this was never pursued during preparation of the RFP.

72. **Question:** Does WSDOT have any design/construction data that would help us assess the general composition and compaction of the fills? Were the fills placed in accordance with WSDOT standard material and compaction requirements?
Response: (1) It is highly unlikely that there is any information on fill type and compaction (density tests) from the 1960's. This information is usually discarded just a few years after construction is completed. (2) It is reasonable to assume that the material when originally placed was placed to the standards at they time of construction at the time.

73. **Question:** Does WSDOT have any maintenance records that would be useful in identifying areas of roadway cut/fill problems in addition to the two known landslide areas? This might include sloughing problems, erosion problems, seepage problems, etc?
Response: The Geotechnical Division (WSDOT) did not pursue "maintenance" records as part of the RFP preparation. Only reports for known areas of slope instability and poor drainage were identified and included in the RFP. Contact Dave Pierce of WSDOT Everett Maintenance.

74. **Question:** Is there any existing pavement thickness information? Would the original design plans and specifications show this and are these available?
Response: Contact Chris Johnson, WSDOT NW Region Materials, 206-768-5907.

75. **Question:** If the D/B team is satisfied with the geotechnical data available after completing a supplemental exploration program, would additional borings still be required to meet the requirements outlined in the Geotechnical Design Manual? This assumes that the D/B team concludes they can adequately characterize subsurface conditions with fewer explorations than stipulated in the Geotechnical Design Manual.
Response: To vary from these policies, the Proposers would have to demonstrate that the criteria stated in the GDM that would allow one to increase test hole spacings (i.e. reduce holes) has been met.

76. **Question:** What type of geotechnical instrumentation other than inclinometers, monitoring wells, and that needed to assess construction vibration impacts does WSDOT require?
Response: WSDOT does not have explicit requirements for construction vibration monitoring. Selection of vibration monitoring instrument types, locations, frequency of readings, etc., is the D-B responsibility. (As a general rule, if vibrations may negatively impact an existing, sensitive structure, vibration monitoring instruments should be used that are capable of measuring peak particle velocities of ¼ inch per second).

77. **Question**: How many of the inclinometers and monitoring wells installed to evaluate the Wood Creek and Lowell landslide areas are still functioning? What are the most recent readings, and can we get copies of this information?
Response: There are only two inclinometers that are currently being read. The test hole information and recent readings are included in the Geotechnical Baseline Report (B-1 and B-2, Shannon & Wilson). While historical records indicate there are other inclinometers in-place, field reviews never uncovered their locations (readings from the late 1990's not included in the RFP are attached).

78. **Question:** Are pile driving/installation records available for those existing bridges along the alignment that are supported on deep foundations?
Response: The HQ Materials Laboratory archives (Geotechnical Division's) do *not* contain pile driving records for the existing I-5 bridges. This information may be available at the historical records maintained at WSDOT HQ Archives in downtown Olympia.

79. **Question:** Section 2.6.4.5 of the RFP indicates that no construction activities along the east shoulder of I-5 that could impact the stability of the existing landslides are allowed. Does this mean the east shoulder in this area cannot be used as a temporary travel lane as part of the construction staging process?
Response: The RFP requires that "no materials or equipment" may be stored on the shoulder or the slopes. The RFP does not preclude the contractor from using the shoulder for traffic staging, providing both the contractor and designer can demonstrate no adverse impacts will occur to the shoulder and the slopes in these sensitive areas.

80. **Question:** Several historical borings are identified in the Geology and Soils Technical Report (Appendix E-5), but they are not included in the Geology and Soils Technical Report nor the Geotechnical Baseline Report and its associated appendices. Will logs of these historical borings be provided? Areas with historical borings that apparently were not included with the RFP include the Wood Creek Slide area, the Lowell Landslide area, the under-crossing at Juniper Drive, north of the existing Broadway off-ramp, Cascade View bridge, and the 41st Street crossing.
Response: WSDOT's Geotechnical Division has all of the boring logs referenced in the Geology and Soils Technical Report (report prepared by Shannon & Wilson), as well as borings from historical bridge plans for all I-5 crossings. Please submit a request to the Everett HOV Project Office with the specific boring number or location. A more complete record of this information can also be reviewed at the HQ Materials Laboratory in Tumwater.

81. **Question:** The Water Quality Site #1 and #2 Hazardous Materials Report (Appendix E-8) indicates several historical piezometers are situated across the proposed Water Quality Site # 2 location. Are boring logs and groundwater measurements from these piezometers available?

Response: The available boring logs for Water Quality Site #1 and #2 are attached and will also be issued as an addendum. Results from the supplemental boring program, to be published by Feb 28th, are intended to include updated piezometer readings from Water Quality Site #2.

Bob Dyer
Everett HOV Project Director